

REMARKS

The Office Action of November 22, 2004 and the references cited have been carefully studied and, in view of the above changes and the following representations, reconsideration and allowance of this application are most respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner states that the term “the information” lacks sufficient antecedent basis. The Examiner suggests that the term “recorded” be added. While Applicant does not completely agree with the Examiner, Applicant does appreciate the Examiner’s comments and suggestions and has amended the claim in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Applicant believes that this amendment overcomes the Examiner’s rejection.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 4-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Mazzilli. According to the Examiner, Mazzilli discloses an observation and recording system for a motor vehicle comprising camera means and means for recording images of the road in front of the vehicle and of the driver of the vehicle observed by the camera means. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant’s invention is directed toward an observation and recording system which is mounted within a motor vehicle. The system allows for the conditions forward of the vehicle to be recorded as well as the driver, the speedometer, and the odometer of the vehicle. Applicant has amended the claims in order to more clearly define his invention. Specifically, the limitations of Claim 7 have been incorporated into Claim 4 and Claim 7 has been cancelled. The

limitation of an electrical jack located on the exterior of the motor vehicle is now being recited in Claim 4. This limitation is not new matter and is fully supported by the specification. The specification has been amended merely to provide proper antecedent basis for the terminology now being used in the claims. Likewise, Claim 8 has been amended to more clearly define the invention and does add any new matter.

Mazzilli discloses a video camera system which has a 360 degree range for video recording inside and outside an automotive vehicle.

Mazzilli does not teach or suggest Applicant's invention as it is now being claimed. For example, Mazzilli does not teach or suggest an electrical jack located on the exterior of the vehicle and that can be connected to the recoding means. Therefore, Mazzilli does not anticipate or render obvious Applicant's invention.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mazzilli in view of Miller. The Examiner states that Mazzilli discloses means for recording information from the interior of the vehicle but does not specifically disclose means for recording information from the odometer and speedometer of the vehicle and that the information is provided by the camera means. The Examiner believes that Miller teaches a camera used in motor vehicles that can observe and record the information from a speedometer and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Miller with the teaching of Mazzilli in order to obtain all of the pertinent and necessary information in a crime scene so that a police officer can use the information as needed. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant's comments regarding Mazzilli made above apply to this rejection as well and will not be repeated. Miller discloses a camera to be mounted in a motor vehicle. Miller does not teach or render obvious Applicant's invention as it is now being claimed. For example, Miller does not disclose an electrical jack located on the exterior of the vehicle where the jack provides a connection to the recording means. Therefore, even if the references relied upon by the Examiner have been properly combined, Applicant's claimed invention would not be taught or rendered obvious.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mazzilli in view of Watkins. According to the Examiner, Mazzilli does not specifically disclose a jack but Watkins teaches the use of a jack and refers to elements 20 and 22 as being used together to function as a jack for connecting a video camera as well as a portable recording device. The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Mazzilli and Watkins in order to permit the police to obtain important information during a crime scene. Applicant respectfully disagrees, as far as this rejection is still applicable.

Applicant's comments regarding Mazzilli made above apply to this rejection as well and will not be repeated here. Watkins adds little, if anything, to the teaching of Mazzilli. Watkins discloses a headrest and seat video imaging apparatus where a recording device is located within a headrest found in the seat of a motor vehicle. The elements 20 and 22 that the Examiner refers to in Watkins are not and cannot be considered an electrical jack. It appears that these elements are a mechanical, threaded connector and bore, respectively. The connector 22 merely secures the video camera 14 in place. Connector 22 does not provide an electrical

connection to a recording means as recited by Applicant much less one that is located on the exterior of the vehicle. Therefore, the teaching of Mazzilli combined with the teaching of Watkins does not teach or render obvious Applicant's invention as it is now being claimed.

In view of all the foregoing, Applicant submits that all of the claims presently in the application clearly and patentably distinguish over the references of record and should be allowed. It is believed that this application is in condition for allowance and an early action toward that end is most respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN P. SENATORE

By:


Norman E. Lehrer

Registration No. 26,561

Dated: February 22, 2005